



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,170	10/22/2001	Ralph Craig Even	A01087B	9801

7590

09/25/2002

Ronald D. Bakule
Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106

EXAMINER

REDDICK, MARIE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1713

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/040,170

Applicant(s)

EVEN, RALPH CRAIG

Examiner

Judy M. Reddick

Art Unit

1713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/22/01 & 03/06/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 & 3. 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. ***Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:***
 - I. ***Claims 1-8, drawn to an aqueous acrylic emulsion polymer, classified in class 524, subclass 556.***
 - II. ***Claims 9 -12, drawn to a method of coating, classified in class 427, subclass 385.5.***
2. ***The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:***
3. ***Inventions Group I and Group II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product, as claimed, can be used in a materially different process such as a powder coating operation or an extrusion process into a free-standing sheet.***
4. ***Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.***
5. ***Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.***
6. ***During a telephone conversation with Mr. Ron Bakule on August 28, 2002 a provisional election was made WITH traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-8. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 9-12 have been withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.***

Information Disclosure Statement

7. ***The information disclosure statements filed 10/22/01 & 03/06/02 have been considered and placed in the application file.***

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: As far as the Examiner can tell and from all indications there is no difference seen between the compositional formulation of Comparative Runs B-D and Inventive Runs 1-3(see pages 14-15).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A) The recited "emulsion polymer" per claims 1 and 4 constitutes indefinite subject matter as per it not being readily ascertainable if a polymer having been produced by an emulsion polymerization procedure and in the form of a latex or the isolated polymer is intended, the two being substantially different.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 1713

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

11. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Young et al(U.S. 2,976,203), Di Benedetti et al(U.S. 3,238,159) or Wolff et al(U.S. 3,238,168).

Each of Young et al, Di Benedetti et al and Wolff et al disclose and exemplify aqueous dispersions based on acrylic emulsion copolymers, useful in forming coating compositions, wherein said emulsion polymers are produced via emulsion polymerizing at least one monoethylenically unsaturated nonionic (meth) acrylic monomer and at least one unsaturated acid monomer in an aqueous system using a redox initiator system and a chain transfer agent. See, e.g., the Abstract, cols. 2-6 and Run I of Young et al, cols. 1-5, 7, 8 and Run V of Di Benedetti et al, cols. 5-7 and Run 5 of Wolff et al. Each of patentees therefore anticipate the instantly claimed invention, with the understanding that the components of each of patentees overlap in scope with the claimed components in both content and character.

It is the base presumption that the PVC and the VOC levels in the coating compositions, as claimed, are met by the coating compositions of Young et al, Di Benedetti et al and Wolff et al since the coating compositions of each of patentees are essentially the same as and made in essentially the same manner as the claimed coating compositions. Applicant has the onus to show that this, in fact, is not the case.

As to the dependent claims, the limitations are either taught by patentees, suggested by patentees or would have been obvious to the skilled artisan and with a reasonable expectation of success.

Art Unit: 1713

Double Patenting

12. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

13. Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 09/882,024. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

14. U.S. 6,403,703 B1 to Stone is cited as of interest in teaching aqueous acrylic polymer latexes, similar to the aqueous acrylic polymer emulsion, as claimed, and is considered merely cumulative to the prior art supra. The additional prior art is cited as of being illustrative of the general state of the art.

Inventorship

15. Applicant is herein apprised that there is a conflict with the Inventor whose name appears on the Declaration and Power Of Attorney form(Ralph Craig Even) and the inventor whose name appears on the IDS Form(Dennis Paul Lorah et al), 10/22/01. Clarification of this matter is required.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Judy M. Reddick whose telephone number is (703)308-4346. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30 a.m.-3:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (703)308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9310 for regular communications and (703)892-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/040,170

Page 6

Art Unit: 1713

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-8183.

J. M. Reddick
Judy M. Reddick
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1713

JMR *JMR*
September 23, 2002